

REMARKS

The present application was filed on March 5, 2002 and contained claims 1-35. An Office Action was issued September 16, 2003 rejection all claims. By the instant amendment, claims 1-35 have been canceled and new claims 36 to 58 are presented. The present Application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and early notification thereof is earnestly solicited.

The Claim Objections

The Office has objected to claim 9 stating that the word “of” was missing between the words “stream” and “liquid”. Claim 9 has been canceled, and this objection is now moot.

The 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

The Office has rejected various of claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103. These rejections are based on Adams, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,178,652). The 103 rejections all use Adams, et al. as the base reference. These grounds of rejection are now believed to be moot, as new claims have been presented.

The new independent claims include many of the features of the previous dependent claims. One of the previous rejections was the combination of Adams, et al. and Ahvenniemi, et al. Applicants believe that this combination is no longer tenable in that the present claims call for wet steam to be used and for a liquid water rinse. Ahvenniemi, et al. specifically go to great lengths to avoid any liquid water in their cleaning system. This is specifically enunciated in the Ahvenniemi, et al. reference at column 1 lines 48-50 and 61-62, column 2 lines 40-43, and column 3 lines 45-48.

Thus, the cleaning system of Ahvenniemi, et al. must avoid wet steam and water rinse, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Ahvenniemi, et al. to produce the method and apparatus of the present claims which specifically call for wet steam cleaning and liquid water rinsing. Also, Ahvenniemi, et al. discloses that their dry steam temperature is 120 °C. However, this temperature is useful for softening adhesives on the roll, and is not specifically stated as being a useful temperature for removing dried inks, as is the object of the present invention. Thus, Ahvenniemi, et al. teaches away from its combination with Adams, et al.

Conclusion

Claims 1-35 have been canceled and new claims 36-58 are now newly presented. Claims 36-58 are believed to be patentable over the prior art of record and allowance thereof is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Schumaker

Reg. No 35,017

e-mail: schumaker@ovonic.com